

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

Claims 1-4 and 5-18 are currently being canceled.

Claims 5, 6, 9 and 10 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 5-14 and 19 are now pending in this application.

**Request for Entry of After-Final Amendment and Reply:**

It is respectfully requested that this "after-final" amendment and reply be considered and entered, since: a) it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance without requiring any further consideration and/or search, and b) at the very least, it is believed to lessen the number of issues for appeal.

**Indication of Allowable Subject Matter:**

Applicant appreciates the indication in the Office Action that claims 5-8 and 11-14 contain allowable subject matter. By way of this amendment and reply, claims 5 and 6 have each been placed in independent form to include the features of their respective base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, claims 5 and 6 are now in allowable form. Claims 7-14 depend either directly or indirectly from either claim 5 or claim 6, and thus claims 7-14 are also now in allowable form. Claim 19 has also been placed in independent form.

**Claim Rejections – Prior Art:**

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,815,252 to Price-Francis; claims 3-4, 9-10 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price-Francis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,924 to Ahn; and claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price-Francis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,377,269 to Heptig et al. Due to the cancellation of claims 1-4 and 15-18, and due to the changed dependencies of claims 9 and 10, these rejections are now moot with respect to claims 3-4, 9-10 and 15-18. With respect to claim 19, that rejection is traversed for the reasons given below.

The Office Action relies on Heptig et al. to allegedly teach a feature in which operation of a device is resumed at a workpoint corresponding to the user's individual information. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Heptig et al., a security system detects the presence of an authorized user identification key, whereupon on removal of that key from the computer, the logic suspends the operation of the computer I/O devices and the execution of application programs. See column 2, lines 25-35 of Heptig et al. Once a user places an authorized key into the computer while the computer is in the suspend mode, the user is deemed authorized to use the computer, and the computer "operation resumes from the point which it was previously suspended." See column 18, lines 56-58 of Heptig et al.

Thus, in Heptig et al., if a first user uses the computer and then removes his/her key, and then a second user places an authorized key in the computer when the computer is in the suspend mode, the second user is allowed to use the computer at the point in operation at which the first user left off. Thus, if the second user continues to use the computer and then removes his/her key, and then if the first user comes back to use the computer, the first user will take over at a point in operation corresponding to when the second user finished using the computer, and not at a point in operation when the first user had finished using the computer the first time.

Claim 19 recites a step of resuming operation by the user of the device, at a workpoint corresponding to the user's individual information. This is not what happens in Heptig et al., since in Heptig et al. the user resumes operation at a workpoint corresponding to the last user's individual information, and not the based on the current user's individual information.

Accordingly, since none of the other cited art of record rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Heptig et al., presently pending claim 19 is patentable over the cited art of record.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the rejections raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 9, 2005

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal  
Registration No. 26,257

Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819